



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,425	04/05/2005	Kees Gerard Willem Goossens	NL03 0793 US	6693

24738 7590 09/18/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

PO BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001

EXAMINER

DRABIK, SARAH E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/18/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/530,425

**Applicant(s)**GOOSSENS, KEES GERARD  
WILLEM**Examiner**

SARAH E. DRABIK

**Art Unit**

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/05/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on April 5, 2005. Claims 1-6 are pending.

#### ***Priority***

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The Foreign application has been filed in parent Application No. PCT/IB03/03036, filed on 07/04/2003, and a European application no. 02079196.8, given the priority date of October 8, 2002.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04/04/2005 was filed with the mailing date of the application on 04/05/2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

#### ***Specification***

4. The abstract is objected to because the format is incorrect. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract

on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 4, line 20, "claim 7" seems to refer to claim 6.

On page 6, lines 31, 32, and 34, "router network RN" does not appear in the drawings.

On page 7, lines 1 and 7, "router network RN" does not appear in the drawings.

On line 8, "slave module T" does not appear in the drawings.

On page 11, line 2, "master module I" does not appear in the drawings. On lines 3 and 4, "slave module T, S" does not appear in the drawings.

On page 14, line 8, "router network RN" does not appear in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claims 1-6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

For claims 1-5, lines 1, "Integrated circuit" should read --An integrated circuit--.

For claim 6, line 1, "Method" should read --A method--.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

For claims 1 and 6, lines 11, "the selected location" has no antecedent basis.

For claim 2, line 4, "the communication" has no antecedent basis. On line 2, "said associated modules" also lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 2-5 are rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Mahler et al. (US 6,381,638).

Mahler et al. teach the invention as claimed, including several modules connected by a network which communicate using a combination network address (Mahler et al., Abstract).

For claim 6, Mahler et al. disclose a method comprising the following:  
a plurality of modules, the messages between the modules being exchanged via a network (see Figs. 3 and 4),  
wherein a message issued by a first module comprises first information indicative for a location of an addressed module within the network (see col. 6, lines 60-66) and second information indicative for a location within the addressed module (see col. 8, lines 3-32),  
arranging the first and the second information as a single address (see col. 8, lines 45-55),  
determining which module is addressed based on the single address (see col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 13), and  
determining the selected location of the addressed module based on the single address (col. 9, lines 1-13).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahler et al. in view of Guerrier et al. ("A Generic Architecture for On-Chip Packet-Switched Interconnections").

Mahler et al. teach the invention substantially as claimed, including several modules connected by a network which communicate using a combination network address (Mahler et al., Abstract).

For claim 1, Mahler et al. disclose a system comprising the following: a plurality of modules and a network arranged for transferring messages between the modules (see Figs. 3 and 4), wherein a message issued by a first module comprises first information indicative for a location of an addressed module within the network (see col. 6, lines 60-66) and second information indicative for a location within the addressed module (see col. 8, lines 3-32), at least one address translation means for arranging the first and the second information as a single address (see col. 8, lines 45-55),

wherein the address translation means is adapted to determine which module is addressed based on the single address (see col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 13), and wherein the selected location of the addressed module is determined based on the single address (see col. 9, lines 1-13).

However, Mahler et al. do not disclose that this system may be an integrated circuit. Guerrier et al. from the same or similar field of endeavor do disclose this limitation (see Abstract and pg. 251, left-hand column, second paragraph). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the network of Mahler et al. with the integrated circuit of Guerrier et al., the motivation for doing so being that it is more scalable and well suited for heterogeneous communication between embedded processors.

For claim 2, Mahler et al. additionally disclose at least one interface means associated to one of the modules for managing the communication between the associated module and the network, wherein one of the address translation means is arranged in one of the interface means (see col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 13).

For claim 3, Mahler et al. further disclose that the address translation means is arranged in the interface means associated to the first module (see col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 23).

For claim 4, Mahler et al. further disclose that the address translation means comprises an address mapping table (see col. 8, lines 56-67).

For claim 5, Mahler et al. further disclose that the address mapping table contains fields for every channel of a connection, for network interface ports of a



connection, and for local addresses in addressed modules (see col. 8, lines 56-67, and Figs. 6 and 7).

### ***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Topham et al. (US 2002/0144078), Agrawal et al. (US 6,567,969), and Essick et al. (US 2005/0050297) are cited to show systems that are considered relevant to the claimed invention.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARAH E. DRABIK whose telephone number is (571)270-3990. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Najjar Saleh can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. E. D./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2155  
9/08/2008

/saleh najjar/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2155